

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,900	FISCHER ET AL.	

All Participants:	Status of Application: <i>allowable</i>
(1) <u>VALERIE RODRIGUEZ-GARCIA</u> .	(3) _____.
(2) <u>Robert Esmond</u> .	(4) _____.
Date of Interview: <u>9 December 2009</u>	Time: <u>3:00pm</u>
Type of Interview:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes, provide a brief description: .	
Part I.	
Rejection(s) discussed: <i>103 obviousness over WO 01/74770A and declaration of unexpected results.</i>	
Claims discussed: <i>1, 5, 8, 17-21</i>	
Prior art documents discussed: <i>WO 01/74770A</i>	
Part II.	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>	
Part III.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	
<i>/V. R. G./</i> Examiner, Art Unit 1626	
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: First, All issues were discussed with Primary Examiner Kamal Saeed in a patentability conference on Dec. 9, 2009 at 12:30pm. The Examiner telephoned Mr. Robert Esmond. The new scope of the claims was discussed and compared to the unexpected results provided in the Declaration. Inclusion of "R1 represents alkenyl" in claim 1 was offered, since it is allowable and new claim 18 includes it. Claims 8, 17, 20 and 21 would be allowable if "herbicide" would be removed. Now, the Declaration of unexpected results would be sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 5, 8 and 17-21 because of the new scope of the invention presented in the claims as amended on 09/10/2009.